

## Summary of Public Hearing Comments. 9/27/99

Sixteen hearings were held with about 2630 people in attendance and around 760 speaking for about 38 hours. Largest groups attendance wise were in Visalia (430) and Stockton (300) and largest groups making presentations were in Sacramento (83), Chico (77) and Oakland (76). One hearing site was added (Los Banos on September 13) after the hearings started. Each of the three major interests groups particularly agriculture, have been making each of the meetings. Each group has offered the following:

### Agriculture

- The potential loss of agricultural land and water is unacceptable. These losses have repercussions across local, regional, state, national and world economies. Substantial social impacts among the local "agriculture dependent" community are also noted. Need to look at an alternative which has less impacts on agriculture. Clearly defined mitigation measures are necessary to offset the impacts.
- Agriculture is working hard to conserve as much water as possible. However, additional water storage, both groundwater and surface, are needed to meet projected population needs for food and fiber.

### Urban

- There is a lack of commitment to improve water quality and reliability and to increase water supply. Need a verifiable increase in supply and quality if S. Cal. is going to support the Program.
- Need to establish a specific schedule for achievement of water quality and salinity targets and establish water quality performance milestones.
- There must be a commitment to an Endangered Species no-surprise policy, i.e., a "deal is a deal" regulatory assurance for water users to insure against further erosion of water supplies.
- Urban areas have been practicing extensive conservation, however additional storage will be needed to meet ever increasing populations.

### Environmental

- There is a lack of serious water conservation in the plan. The program needs to include a "soft path" solution. Need to price water correctly if conservation is going to work.
- The proposed North Delta Diversion is the first step in building a Peripheral Canal. This facility as well as the P.C. should be deleted from further consideration.
- The Program should not construct new dams. Seems ludicrous to propose as a solution the very thing (dams) that caused the problems.

### Local comments

- At Stockton there was substantial concern about the South Delta bundle particularly the delayed decision on a Grant Line Canal barrier and that the potential North Delta diversion is the beginning of the Peripheral Canal.
- At Los Banos, commentators stressed that CALFED should find a way to restore westside water reallocated because of biological opinions and CVPIA.
- In Visalia, commentators stressed that the Program lacked balance, i.e. the Program is very

specific about and going forward with a multitude of ERP actions, the ERP will impact hundreds of thousands of acres of agricultural land, a large part of the funding is for ERP and 750K AF of water are identified for the ERP whereas items key to agriculture such as surface storage are quite nebulous and storage efforts in the first 7 years consist of just studies, funding is minimal and the water for ERP is coming once again from agriculture.

- In Chico, commentors expressed concerns about the merits of groundwater storage and water transfers.
- Agricultural interests in Salinas and Santa Rosa questioned why they were part of CALFED's Solution Area. Concerned that the "government" was going to take their water and land.
- The Bay area commentors (Oakland and San Jose) have asked when the Program will deal with the "Bay" part of the Bay-Delta Program.
- Southern Cal. commentors believe CALFED has abandoned the conveyance facility (Peripheral Canal).
- Environmental Justice comments were noted in Salinas, Oakland and Antioch. Requested CALFED take a closer look at consequences to minority groups and communities; that EJ groups be funded so they can participate in the Program, and that BDAC include a member that would speak for EJ issues.

### Hearing Summary

Location/Date	# in Attendance	# of Speaker Cards	# of Actual Speakers
Stockton, 8/18	300	51	45
San Bernardino, 8/19	60	24	24
Huntington Park, 8/24	75	34	32
Salinas, 8/25	45	18	18
Oakland, 8/26	250	91	76
Pasadena, 8/31	110	43	40
San Diego, 9/1	110	35	35
Costa Mesa, 9/2	130	48	46
San Jose, 9/7	170	70	53
Antioch, 9/8	100	36	33
Santa Rosa, 9/9	120	67	56
Los Banos, 9/13	140	41	41
Visalia, 9/14	420	67	55
Chico, 9/15	230	87	77
Redding, 9/21	130	44	44
Sacramento, 9/22	240	101	83
Totals	2,630	857	758

### Written Comment Summary

Individual Comment Letters (to date plus 200)	1,400
Unknown Campaign (no new dams, conservation)	1,400
CalTrout Campaign (no new dams, conservation)	1,100
Boaters Campaign (boaters should be stakeholders, up access)	540
Total	4,440